



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028538](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028538)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Husain, M. I., Strawbridge, R. C., Carter, B. R., Young, A., & Andre F. Carvalho (2019). Efficacy and acceptability of adjunctive psychological and pharmacological interventions for treatment-resistant depression: protocol for a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*, 9(5), 1-5. [e028538]. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028538>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Efficacy and acceptability of adjunctive psychological and pharmacological interventions for treatment-resistant depression: protocol for a systematic review and network meta-analysis

Muhammad I. Husain MBBS, MD(Res.), MRCPsych (Corresponding Author)

Centre for Addiction and Mental Health,
100 Stokes Street,
Toronto,
Ontario,
Canada,
M6J 1H4
Ishrat.husain@camh.ca

Rebecca Strawbridge PhD

Department of Psychological Medicine,
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience,
King's College London,
De Crespigny Park,
London,
United Kingdom
SE5 8AF

Ben Carter PhD

Department of Psychological Medicine,
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience,
King's College London,
De Crespigny Park,
London,
United Kingdom
SE5 8AF

Brett Jones MD

Centre for Addiction and Mental Health,
100 Stokes Street,
Toronto,
Ontario,
Canada,
M6J 1H4

Allan H. Young FRCPsych

Department of Psychological Medicine,
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience,
King's College London,
De Crespigny Park,
London,
United Kingdom
SE5 8AF

Andre F. Carvalho MD, PhD

Centre for Addiction and Mental Health,
100 Stokes Street,
Toronto,
Ontario,
Canada,
M6J 1H4

Abstract:

Introduction: Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) is a common debilitating illness worldwide. The vast majority of patients with MDD will not achieve remission with first-line treatment and despite the availability of different treatment modalities, at least one-third of patients experience treatment-resistant depression (TRD). There continues to be a paucity of research focused on treatment options for patients with TRD thus treatment decisions are largely based on patient and clinician preference as opposed to evidence-based practice. Herein we propose a systematic review and network meta-analysis of available pharmacological and psychological augmentation treatments for TRD, to inform evidence-based management of TRD.

Methods and analysis: We plan to conduct a search of electronic databases (MEDLINE and ISIWEB) of all dates from inception for randomized controlled trials of pharmacological and psychological augmentation interventions for adults with TRD. Articles for review will be included based upon consensus from two authors. Pharmaceutical companies will be contacted for access to any unpublished data. A network meta-analysis will compare the effectiveness pharmacological adjunctive agents for TRD using a pre-post analysis, assuming consistency and transitivity. The protocol has been registered with PROSPERO: CRD42019132588

Ethics and Dissemination: This project does not require research ethics board approval. The dissemination plan is to present findings at international scientific meetings and publishing results in a peer-reviewed academic journal.

Strengths and Limitations of the study:

- This will be the most comprehensive review of published and unpublished data of pharmacological and psychological augmentation treatments for TRD.
- The results will provide the highest level of evidence to inform clinicians on the best choice of treatment from among the available pharmacological and psychological interventions for TRD.
- The reporting of the protocol has been guided by PRISMA and has been registered with International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews.
- The study does not include brain stimulation interventions and trials of agents used as monotherapy.

Introduction

As of 2017, the World Health Organization classifies major depressive disorder (MDD) as the leading cause of disability world wide.[1] Economic estimates report that the annual attributable financial loss due to MDD is \$83 billion.[2] Though there are effective treatments for MDD, those who seek treatment are often faced with a relapsing and recurring course of illness. Based on community surveys, the finding that lifetime prevalence is two to three times that of 12-month prevalence suggests that between one-third and one-half of lifetime cases have recurrent episodes in a given year.[3] The STAR*D study, which was the largest naturalistic study on treatments for MDD to date, indicated that remission rates on the first treatment trial were approximately one third and subsequent remission rates decreased as the number of treatment trials increased.[4] The STAR*D findings indicate that at least a third of patients are likely to be experiencing treatment-resistant depression (TRD). Those suffering from TRD are left suffering from a significant decline in their social and occupational functioning and higher rates of all-cause mortality.[5] Persistent symptoms in TRD often translate into exponential increases in work loss and medical costs compared to more responsive forms of illness.

In the clinical setting, very few patients are treatment naïve or are experiencing their first major depressive episode, yet the vast majority of research on treatment for MDD has focussed on single-episode depression. Very few studies have looked at the specific patient population that is treatment-resistant. When a patient presents as refractory to first line antidepressant (AD) medication, a crucial clinical question is whether to augment, make an AD switch or switch treatment modalities. A recent review outlined the current evidence-base and treatment modalities available for treatment-resistant depression (TRD).[6] Despite the summary of evidence, it does not provide guidance as to whether individuals should receive augmentation, discontinuation or switch to alternative treatment strategies. This decision remained largely dependent on patient and clinician preference.[6] Although there have been recent network meta-analyses published attempting to answer this clinical question, they have been limited by either setting a loose definition of TRD (i.e. one failed treatment only), restricting the search to a narrow range of publication dates, excluding unpublished data, excluding trials of psychological interventions, and excluding trials of novel treatment options such as anti-inflammatory agents.[7-9] Therefore we aim to address these limitations and herein present the protocol for a network meta-analysis of current available evidence of both psychological and pharmacological augmentation treatments for treatment-resistant depression.

Objective:

To assess and compare the effectiveness of psychological and pharmacological augmentation treatments for treatment-resistant depression (TRD) using a network meta-analysis (NMA) approach. Since NMA combines evidence base on both direct and indirect comparison it maximises data included in analyses and provides relative estimates of effectiveness of all interventions considered. Specifically we aim to:

1. Determine the effectiveness of all psychological and pharmacological adjunctive agents for TRD, in comparison to one another
2. Determine the acceptability and tolerability of these treatments

Methods and Analysis:

The reporting of the protocol has been guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement.[10] The protocol has been registered with PROSPERO: CRD42019132588.

Patient and Public Involvement

Treatment resistant depression is a major public health concern and contributes to persistent suffering and frustration at an individual patient level. Our findings will help address this concern to better serve the patients we see in practice. Since this is a secondary analysis, it was felt at this time, patient and public involvement was not required to inform the design of this particular study. As described above, we will widely disseminate our findings to reach the highest impact.

Eligibility Criteria:

Participants and setting

We will include studies that recruited:

- Participants of any gender.
- Participants aged ≥ 18 . It may be that treatment efficacies differ for patients with late-life depression; as such, studies recruiting patients solely over age 65 will be excluded. Furthermore, we will conduct a sensitivity analysis to determine the effect of age on outcomes.
- We will exclude studies that enrolled patients with comorbid neurologic disorders.
- Any setting can be included and this data is extracted for potential network meta-regression.
- Studies must have required participants to have treatment-resistant depression, defined as meeting all of the following criteria:
 - a) Currently meets diagnostic criteria for major depressive disorder according to ICD 10 Code F32-3, DSM-IV 296 and DSM-5 296.[11-13] Trials with ICD 9 and DSM III/IIIR diagnoses approximating to these codes are also considered appropriate.
 - b) Within the current depressive episode, have not sufficiently responded to at least two adequate trials of an evidenced based treatment for depression, as utilised in the most popular TRD definitions.[14-16] Any studies that include non-response to within-class antidepressant switches (e.g. two SSRI's, or two SNRI's) as contributing to TRD will be included, due to evidence demonstrating that failure to respond after within-class antidepressant switch should contribute to the staging of TRD.[17] Similarly, we consider failure to respond to an adequate course of a psychological treatment to also contribute to TRD staging and thus this will be eligible for inclusion.[18] For instance, if patients have not responded to adequate trials of a SSRI and CBT, this will be eligible for inclusion in the present study. In line with commonly used TRD definitions, we will only consider treatment resistance within a current episode.

We will exclude:

- Studies of children or adolescents (<18 years of age), due to differing treatment mechanisms in young people, particularly with regard to antidepressants.
- Studies where N < 10 participants randomised.[19]
- Studies including patients with bipolar disorder and psychoses will be excluded (unless data are available for the subgroup of non-psychotic, unipolar participants), due to the well-documented differences in treatment efficacy for patients with these syndromes. However, multiple comorbidities are extremely common in TRD and therefore we will permit the inclusion of studies not excluding participants with most psychiatric and physical comorbidities.

Interventions

Permitted pharmacological treatments include those included in the Maudsley Treatment Inventory derived from the Maudsley Prescribing Guidelines and other standardised guidelines for depression treatment. We also include any treatment that has multiple meta-analyses supporting its use (e.g. minocycline, which is not included in the MTI).[20]

For psychological agents, there has been far less standardisation and definition of appropriate antidepressant therapies. Permitted psychological treatments will comprise those recommended in the most recent NICE guidelines for depression (those only recommended for mild depression are not included) and comprise: computerised or face-to-face cognitive behavioural therapies (CBT), behavioural activation (BA), interpersonal therapy (IPT), manualised psychodynamic therapy (STPT), behavioural couples therapy, cognitive behavioural analysis system of psychotherapy (CBASP), or mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (MBCT).

Due to the variation between treatments in duration required for clinical effectiveness, trials will be considered adequate and therefore included if the article reports expectations of clinical efficacy.

These are the criteria for both augmentation and initial treatments. While any evidence based initial treatment is permitted (pharmacological or psychological) it is anticipated that the majority of, if not all, studies will have recruited medicated TRD patients.

Comparators

Eligible comparator treatments include: Placebo, another pharmacological agent, another psychological intervention, waiting list, active control or treatment-as-usual (TAU).

Outcomes

We will only include studies that report depression-rating scales in each treatment arm.

Study designs and publication types

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs), cluster RCTs or the first phase of randomised cross-over trials. Trials must include randomisation to at least one suitable augmentation treatment (where patients are taking at least one continuing treatment prior to randomisation to further intervention). Eligibility of both initial and augmentation treatments is described below.

Language and timeframe

For any articles not available in English, maximum efforts will be made to translate text such that all studies can be included. The search will be created from all years up to the date of systematic search, December 21st 2018. We intend for the analysis and drafting of the manuscript to be reviewed and submitted to publication by September 1st, 2019.

Information Source and Search Strategy:

Electronic databases MEDLINE, www.clinicaltrials.gov, and ISI Web of Science will be searched along with citation lists from notable papers, available reviews and subsequently of included articles. The following search terms are applied:

(depress* OR MDD OR major depress*) AND
(resistan* OR refractor* OR non-respon* OR nonrespon* OR un-respon* OR unrespon* OR TRD OR fail* OR inadequate OR difficult OR intractable) AND
(augment* OR adjunct* OR add-on OR combin* OR co-administ*) AND
(randomi* OR RCT) AND
(treatment OR intervention OR trial).

For the network meta-analysis, the systematic search will be maximised by contacting pharmaceutical companies and additional authors in an attempt to collate data from unpublished studies

Study Selection

All studies generated from the systematic searches will be evaluated against the pre-defined inclusion criteria by two of the review authors independently. Any disparities will be addressed by reaching agreement via two additional review authors. We will use the GRADE approach to rank the quality of available evidence.

Data Extraction

This will be conducted by two review authors independently and will include quality assessment, description of participants, description of the intervention and control groups, psychometric data and outcomes. Disagreements will be resolved via further discussion with a third review author.

Assessment of risk of bias

The methodological quality and specifically risk of bias, of included studies, will be addressed by employing the SIGN (Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network) tool in conjunction with the Cochrane risk of bias (RoB) tool. Two authors will extract this data independently, as above. The data extracted will relate to quality across nine domains: sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of outcome assessors, use of intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis, comparability of randomised groups at baseline, inter-site differences in findings, the potential for selective outcome reporting and presence of for-profit bias (allegiance). Additional sources of bias that will be assessed will include novelty bias and sponsorship bias. A sensitivity analysis will assess the difference in statistical effects between studies with a high and low risk of bias.

Outcome Measure(s)

Primary outcome(s)

The primary outcome will be treatment effectiveness using any validated assessment of illness severity, which is repeated from baseline to endpoint. Where multiple outcomes are reported, the primary outcome for inclusion in analyses will be selected in a hierarchical fashion: the most preferable scale will be a clinician-rated assessment of depression severity (HAM-D, MADRS, IDS or validated subscales of these), followed by a patient-rated measure (PHQ-9, IDS or BDI) or if not available, an assessment of global improvement (such as the CGI, LIFE chart measure, or GAS) or related symptoms (such as anxiety). Where multiple endpoints are reported, this review will consider the primary endpoint reported by each study.

Secondary outcome(s)

1. Response rate measured by the total number of patients who had a reduction of $\geq 50\%$ of the total score on a standardised rating scale for depression.
2. Remission rates as measured by a standardised rating scale for depression
3. All-cause discontinuation will be used as a measure for the acceptability of treatments, because it encompasses efficacy and tolerability.

Statistical Analysis

Aggregate data (as opposed to individual patient-level) will likely need to be used for the present quantitative analyses. Descriptive statistics of study and participant characteristics will be examined and studies must be sufficiently homogeneous to be included in analyses. Pooled effect sizes (ES) will be calculated from continuous (standardised mean differences; Hedges' g . Standard deviation (SD) will be input where possible, or imputed from standard errors (SE), confidence intervals (95% CI) or p-values.

We will generate a network plot, consisting of all of the direct evidence, weighted by number of number of studies connecting the nodes. Relative effectiveness will be examined by calculating relative ES (probability of each treatment to be best). These probabilities are expressed by a Surface under the Cumulative Ranking curve (SUCRA) percentage, used to create the probability of the best treatment option, across all interventions.

Depending on data availability, we may attempt to explore potential explanatory factors using sensitivity analysis / meta-regression. Examples of potentially important variables include: study quality, extent of treatment resistance, initial treatments, comorbidities, age, gender or ethnicity of sample, depression severity, duration of episode, duration of intervention, treatment setting. Novelty bias, sponsorship bias, definition or criteria used for TRD. These should be included as possible sources of inconsistency.

Assumptions of the Network Meta-Analysis

The comparator groups will be explored for homogeneity of clinical context. Where these are considered to not exhibit contextual diversity, the assumptions of transitivity and similarity will be compared by

observation between direct and indirect comparisons. An intention-to-treat (ITT) approach will be taken to missing data. Heterogeneity of the network will be measured using I^2 , and τ^2 within and across comparisons.

Limitations:

One of the main limitations of this review is that it only includes only of trials of augmentation treatments, thus excluding many of the ketamine investigations which have been trialled as a monotherapy. We also did not include trials of brain stimulation interventions, which are sometimes used with good effect for TRD. Since brain stimulation interventions are excluded, the findings may over-represent patients who are inappropriate for, or lack access to, brain stimulation treatments. Our search strategy was limited to MEDLINE, Clinicaltrials.gov and ISI Web of Science although we expect adequate and efficient coverage with these databases. While interpreting the meta-analysis, we have to consider the heterogeneity of the dose/intensity and duration of the intervention, which is not always standardised across interventions. Network meta-analyses make both direct and indirect comparisons and we will aim to assess for inconsistencies of these two comparisons by using the node-splitting method in our statistical analysis.

Ethics and Dissemination Plan:

This project does not require research ethics board approval as it does not directly involve human or animal participants and is a review of available literature. We plan to present our findings at national and international scientific meetings. We also plan to publish our results in a reputable peer-reviewed academic journal.

Authors Contributions:

MIH contributed to the methodology and led the first draft of the protocol. RS developed the initial methodology and helped write the first draft of the protocol. BJ contributed to the first draft of the manuscript, is updating searches and is obtaining unpublished data from pharmaceutical companies. BC contributed to the methodology and statistical analysis plan. AHY and AFC conceived the idea for this network meta-analysis and provided critical feedback on the search strategy, methodology and manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding Source:

This study represents independent research partly funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

Conflicts of Interest:

MIH, RS, BJ, BC and AFC have no conflicts of interests to declare. AHY has received honoraria for speaking from Astra Zeneca, Lundbeck, Eli Lilly, Sunovion; honoraria for consulting from Allergan, Livanova and Lundbeck, Sunovion, Janssen; and research grant support from Janssen, in the last 3 years.

References:

1. WHO. (2017). *Depression and Other Common Mental Disorders Global Health Estimates*.
2. Greenberg, P. E., Kessler, R. C., Birnbaum, H. G., Leong, S. A., Lowe, S. W., Berglund, P. A., &

- Corey-Lisle, P. K. (2003). The economic burden of depression in the United States: how did it change between 1990 and 2000? *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 64(12), 1465–75.
3. Kessler, R. C., & Bromet, E. J. (2013). The epidemiology of depression across cultures. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 34, 119–38. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-114409>
 4. Rush, J.A., & Jain, S. (2018). Clinical Implications of the STAR*D Trial (pp. 1–49). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. http://doi.org/10.1007/164_2018_153
 5. Reutfors, J., Andersson, T. M. L., Brenner, P., Brandt, L., DiBernardo, A., Li, G., ... Bodén, R. (2018). Mortality in treatment-resistant unipolar depression: A register-based cohort study in Sweden. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 238(February), 674–679. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.06.030>
 6. McIntyre, R. S., Filteau, M. J., Martin, L., Patry, S., Carvalho, A., Cha, D. S., ... Miguelez, M. (2014). Treatment-resistant depression: Definitions, review of the evidence, and algorithmic approach. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.10.043>
 7. Papadimitropoulou, K., Vossen, C., Karabis, A., Donatti, C., & Kubitz, N. (2017). Comparative efficacy and tolerability of pharmacological and somatic interventions in adult patients with treatment-resistant depression: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Current Medical Research and Opinion*, 33(4), 701–711. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2016.1277201>
 8. Zhou, X., Keitner, G. I., Qin, B., Ravindran, A. V, Bauer, M., Del Giovane, C., ... Xie, P. (2015). Atypical Antipsychotic Augmentation for Treatment-Resistant Depression: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, 18(11), pyv060. <http://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyv060>
 9. Zhou, X., Ravindran, A. V, Qin, B., Del Giovane, C., Li, Q., Bauer, M., ... Xie, P. (2015). Comparative efficacy, acceptability, and tolerability of augmentation agents in treatment-resistant depression: Systematic review and network meta-analysis. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 76(4), e487–e498. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4088/JCP.14r09204>
 10. Shamseer, L., Moher, D., Clarke, M., Ghera, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., ... Whitlock, E. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (prisma-p) 2015: Elaboration and explanation. *BMJ (Online)*. <http://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7647>
 11. WHO. (1992). *The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders Clinical descriptions and diagnostic guidelines* World Health Organization.
 12. First, M., Gibbon, M., Spitzer, R., & Williams, J. (1996). *User Guide for the Structural Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I Disorders*. APA. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
 13. American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
 14. Anderson, I., Ferrier, I., Baldwin, R., Cowen, P., Howard, L., Lewis, G., ... Tylee, A. (2008). Evidence-based guidelines for treating depressive disorders with antidepressants: A revision of the 2000 British Association for Psychopharmacology guidelines. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 22(4), 343–396. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0269881107088441>
 15. NICE. (2007). *Depression in Adults (update) Depression: the treatment and management of depression in adults National Clinical Practice Guideline Number X National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health Commissioned by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Exc.*
 16. Souery, D., Amsterdam, J., de Montigny, C., Lecrubier, Y., Montgomery, S., Lipp, O., ... Mendlewicz, J. (1999). Treatment resistant depression: methodological overview and operational criteria. *European Neuropsychopharmacology: The Journal of the European College of Neuropsychopharmacology*, 9(1–2), 83–91.
 17. Papakostas, G. I., Fava, M., & Thase, M. E. (2008). Treatment of SSRI-resistant depression: A meta-analysis comparing within- versus across-class switches. *Biological Psychiatry*, 63(7), 699–704. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2007.08.010>
 18. Wiles, N., Thomas, L., Abel, A., Ridgway, N., Turner, N., Campbell, J., ... Lewis, G. (2013). Cognitive behavioural therapy as an adjunct to pharmacotherapy for primary care based patients with treatment resistant depression: results of the CoBaIT randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*, 381(9864), 375–384. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)61552-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61552-9)
 19. Bandelow, B., Reitt, M., Röver, C., Michaelis, S., Görlich, Y., & Wedekind, D. (2015). Efficacy of treatments for anxiety disorders. *International Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 30(4), 183–192. <http://doi.org/10.1097/YIC.0000000000000078>
 20. Fekadu, A., Donocik, J. G., & Cleare, A. J. (2018). Standardisation framework for the Maudsley staging method for treatment resistance in depression. *BMC Psychiatry*, 18(1), 100. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1679-x>

